



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/054,689

11/13/2001

Harry V. Weber

WBE-1

5262

22827 7590 01/22/2009
DORITY & MANNING, P.A.
POST OFFICE BOX 1449
GREENVILLE, SC 29602-1449

EXAMINER

DASS, HARISH T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3692

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/22/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/054,689	Applicant(s) WEBER, HARRY V.	
	Examiner HARISH T. DASS	Art Unit 3692	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 October 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11-13, 15, 17, 19-25, 56, 57 and 59-66 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-13, 15, 17, 19-25, 56-57, 59-66 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to applicant's communication of 10/08/2008.

2. Status of claims:

Claims 1-10, 14, 16, 18, 26-55, 58 are canceled.

Claims 11-13, 15, 17, 19-25, 56-57, 59-66 (60-66 new claims) are pending.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 10/08/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

a. **In response to applicant's argument** "After a careful reading of In re Comiskey, it is clear that the web-based applications set forth in claims 11 and 60 do NOT correspond to purely mental processes, ..." The test for Comiskey is the process must be tied to another statutory class. This rejection test has been upheld by the Supreme Court, see In re Bilski. An example of a method claim that would not qualify as a statutory process would be a claim that recited purely mental steps. Thus, to qualify as a § 101 statutory process, the claim should positively recite the other statutory class (the thing or product) to which it is tied, for example **by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps, or positively recite the subject matter that is being transformed, for example by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state.**

Here, applicant's method steps fail the first prong of the new Federal Circuit decision since they are not tied to a machine and can be performed without the use of a particular machine. **The mere recitation of the machine in the preamble with an absence of a machine in the body of the claim** fails to make the claim statutory under 35 USC 101. Note the Board of Patent Appeals

Informative Opinion Ex parte Langemyer et al-

http://iplaw.bna.com/iplw/5000/split_display.adp?fedfid=10988734&vname=ippqc ases2&wsn=500826000&searchid=6198805&doctypeid=1&type=court&mode=doc&split=0&scm=5000&pg=0

b. **In response to applicant's argument** "Claims 11 and 60 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention allegedly lacks patentable utility..." Applicant's argument is not persuasive because none of the step concretely states the result of the process, the limitation are drawn to merely for an intended use. The limitation should positively claim the process. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

However the subject matter of a properly construed claim is defined by the terms that limit its scope. It is this subject matter that must be examined. As a general matter, the grammar and intended meaning of terms used in a claim will dictate whether the language limits the claim scope. Language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation. The following are examples of language that may raise a question as to the limiting effect of the language in a claim:

- (A) statements of intended use or field of use,
- (B) "adapted to" or "adapted for" clauses,
- (C) "wherein" clauses, or
- (D) "whereby" clauses.

This list of examples is not intended to be exhaustive. See also MPEP § 2111.04. **>USPTO personnel are to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim should not be read into the claim. E-

Pass Techs., Inc. v. 3Com Corp., 343 F.3d 1364, 1369, 67 USPQ2d 1947, 1950 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (claims must be interpreted “in view of the specification” without importing limitations from the specification into the claims unnecessarily). In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-551 (CCPA 1969). See also In re Zletz, 893 F.2d 319, 321-22, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (“During patent examination the pending claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow.... The reason is simply that during patent prosecution when claims can be amended, ambiguities should be recognized, scope and breadth of language explored, and clarification imposed.... An essential purpose of patent examination is to fashion claims that are precise, clear, correct, and unambiguous.

c. **In response to applicant’s argument** “REJECTION OF CLAIMS 11-13, 15, 17, 19-25, 56-57 AND 59-66 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH: Claims 11-13, 15, 17, 19-25, 56-57 and 59-66 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, ...”

Rejection of claims 11-13, 15, 17, 19-25, 56-57 and 59-66 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph **is removed** based on the Applicant’s explanation on record and support in original specification.

d. **In response to applicant’s argument** “Claims 11-13, 15, 17, 19-25, 56-57 and 59-66 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, a being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. More particularly, numbered page 5 of the June 12, 2008 Office Action alleges the following: ...” See supra.

Response to Applicant’s Argument under 35 U.S.C. § 103

e. **In response to applicant's argument** "Any attempt to cure the deficiencies of Regan by reference to "well known elements" is improper and fails to establish a prima face case of obviousness. ..."

To adequately traverse such a finding, an applicant must specifically point out the supposed errors in the examiner's action, which would include stating why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art. See 37 CFR 1.111(b). See also *Chevenard*, 139 F.2d at 713, 60 USPQ at 241 ("[I]n the absence of any demand by appellant for the examiner to produce authority for his statement, we will not consider this contention."). A general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without any reference to the examiner's assertion of official notice would be inadequate. If applicant adequately traverses the examiner's assertion of official notice, the examiner must provide documentary evidence in the next Office action if the rejection is to be maintained. See 37 CFR 1.104(c)(2). See also *Zurko*, 258 F.3d at 1386, 59 USPQ2d at 1697 ("[T]he Board [or examiner] must point to some concrete evidence in the record in support of these findings" to satisfy the substantial evidence test). If the examiner is relying on personal knowledge to support the finding of what is known in the art, the examiner must provide an affidavit or declaration setting forth specific factual statements and explanation to support the finding. See 37 CFR 1.104(d)(2).

If applicant does not traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice or applicant's traverse is not adequate, the examiner should **clearly indicate in the next Office action that the common knowledge or well-known** in the art statement is taken to be admitted prior art because applicant either failed to traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice or that the traverse was inadequate. If the traverse was inadequate, the examiner should include an explanation as to why it was inadequate.

In response to "to the extent that such features are ..." **In the last office action (Paper number 20080608), the Examiner has provided two document in support of his official notice**, even than Applicant without providing any

support for his argument inadequately traverses the rejection and demands support. Applicant should provide documentary evidence that "student financial aid" and its loan processing and "FTP" were unknown prior to or at the time of the invention.

Further, in originally filed specification admitted prior art (pages 2-3) applicant admits that processing of financial aid (manually and interactively) are prior arts. In page 3 Applicant admits that an interactive web-based system for student aid is available on line. The question arises how the web-based system www.enconsert.com communicates between the user and the web server if the transfer (receiving/transmitting) such electronic document (web-page or application) was unknown prior to applicant's invention? The Applicant has not disclosed any file transfer protocol of his own.

f. **In response to applicant's argument** "When considering whether a proposed combination of references is proper under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the prior art "must be considered in its entirety, i.e., as a whole, including portions that would lead away from the claimed invention." See MPEP § 2141.02 (quoting from W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 721 F.2d 1540, 220 U.S.P.Q. 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984), emphasis added. Even after the recent Supreme Court decision in KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. ___, 82 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1385, 1397 (2007), a prior art reference that "teaches away" from the claimed invention is a significant factor to be considered in determining obviousness. (See MPEP § 2145, emphasis added.) Specifically, it is improper to combine references where the references teach away from their combination. In re Grasselli, 713 F.2d 731,743, 218 U.S.P.Q. 769, 779 (Fed. Cir. 1983), emphasis added.

Applicant did not provide any detail, simple alleged that these reference teach away. Since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old techniques (elements) and one of ordinary skill in the art (administrator – see prior art) would have recognized that applying the known technique of secondary

Art Unit: 3692

references "Ireland", Norris (analogous art), and AAPA to "Regan" would have been an obvious and yielded predictable results and resulted in an improved loan processing and approval system for students. In conclusion, the claim limitations are known elements and prior art and one skill in the art could have combined the elements by known method and yielded predictable results (See KSR).

g. **In response to applicant's argument "Applicant's Declaration Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132 is entered and has been considered, but it does not place the application in condition for allowance, see below."** Just because other non-§103 rejections were set forth in the recent Office Action, the Examiner cannot ignore the evidence of secondary considerations submitted by Applicant. Applicant should provide evidence of success based on requirement of MPEP § 716.03 (a) and § 716.03 (b). With all respect to Mr. Weber's statement, merely stating that system has been purchased by 35 educational institutions is not sufficient. Applicant should provide all relevant documents based on MPEP 716.03 and additionally sales data, and market share (MPEP 716.03(b) IV).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

The claims 11-13, 15, 17, 19-25, 56-57, 59-66 are directed to non-statutory subject matter. Patent statute does not allow patents to be issued on particular business systems and method that depend for their operation on human intelligence alone.

In case of claim 11 and its dependent claims (12-13, 15, 17, 19-25, 56-57, 59), web-based application for providing a multilevel financial aid system featuring integrated and automated on-line financial aid features specific to a given educational institution to a user is unpatentable as directed to nonstatutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101, and the claimed invention does not fall within one of the four statutory categories (Computer per se). Since mental processes standing alone are not patentable, even if they have practical applications. The claim 11, at issue does not use of machine and does not describe process of manufacture or process for alteration of composition of matter, and since claim instead cover use of mental processes to solve the step of determining financial product to purchase and purchasing amount for maximizing objective function on the basis of input data, and thus seek to patent use of human intelligence in and of itself. Ref: In re Comiskey, 84 USPQ2d 1670(Fed. Cir.2007).

In case of claim 60 and its dependent claim (61-66), web-based application, for providing a multi-level financial aid system featuring integrated and automated on-line financial aid features specific to a given educational institution is unpatentable as directed to nonstatutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101, and the claimed invention does not fall within one of the four statutory categories. Since mental processes standing alone are not patentable, even if they have practical applications. The claim 60, at issue does not use of machine and does not describe process of manufacture or process for alteration of composition of matter, and since claim instead cover use of

Art Unit: 3692

mental processes to solve the step of determining financial product to purchase and purchasing amount for maximizing objective function on the basis of input data, and thus seek to patent use of human intelligence in and of itself. Ref: In re Comiskey, 84 USPQ2d 1670(Fed. Cir.2007).

Claims 11 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention lacks patentable utility. The claimed invention does not produce a tangible result, it simply describes list of services with out how the services are used and what they are used for, to provide a tangible and concert result.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 11-13, 15, 17, 19-25, 56-57, 59-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 11 and claim 60, beside being a descriptive material (computer per se), have missing steps for example, “a service for comparing”, where is the result of comparing and where the result is used? Similarly for other services with intended use “for” clauses, where the claims do not positively indicate the next step which uses the result of the service (do not claim any following functionality which uses the

Art Unit: 3692

information). The claimed language has missing step which create gap in the process of the invention for concrete and tangible result.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made

Claims 11-13, 15, 17, 19-25, 56-57, 59-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marybeth Regan (hereinafter Regan – “Utilizing the Internet in education”, College and University, Washington: Spring 2001 Vol. 76, Iss, 4; pg 37, 8pgs”) in view of Ireland et al. (hereinafter Ireland – US 7,062,462) and Norris (US 5,870,721) and Applicant’s Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

Re. Claim 11, Regan discloses a first information collection service for obtaining requested personal and financial information about a given student [pages 4 paragraph # 8 to page 5 paragraph # 2], Internet FTP for transferring files, a federal link service (see at least internet network to connect and link between student, professor ...; www.fafsa.ed.gov).

Art Unit: 3692

Regan does not explicitly disclose

a financial aid estimation service for evaluating the information obtained via said first information collection service and generating a predicted amount of monetary aid that may be available for the student to use for education-related expenses at a given educational institution;

receiving an electronic copy of an Institutional Student Information Report (ISIR) document for the given student;

a service for comparing information obtained via said first information collection service and the given student's ISIR document;

a service for determining an authorized amount of financial aid the given student is eligible for at the given educational institution; and

a service for providing an award notice to the given student based on the determination of authorized financial aid eligibility

However, Student loan/financial aid process, FAFSA and Institutional Student Information Report (ISIR) are well known elements and ISIR is send/received by schools electronically as well as paper copy. Further, are known means of file transfer (receiving/transmitting) using Internet FTP and computers, where FTP uses the address (link) of the web-server to receive/transmit files (documents, reports, etc), batch programming and telnet for automation of computer processing and viewing documents.

Ireland discloses a financial aid estimation service; generating a predicted amount of monetary aid that may be available for the student to use for education-related expenses at a given educational institution; and a service for providing an award

Art Unit: 3692

notice to the given student based on the determination of authorized financial aid eligibility [Figures 1-3; col. 15 lines 4-26; col. 7 lines 6-31, additionally see figures which have more information]. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Regan and include a financial aid estimation service; generating a predicted amount of monetary aid that may be available for the student to use for education-related expenses at a given educational institution; and a service for providing an award notice to the given student based on the determination of authorized financial aid eligibility, as disclosed by Ireland, to provide an online student financial aid resource which allows the student/parent to calculate the estimated cost of educational and available financial aid require for student to attend an educational institution.

AAPA discloses evaluating the information obtained via said first information collection service; a service for determining an authorized amount of financial aid the given student is eligible for at the given educational institution [page 1-3 (background)]. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Regan and Ireland and include evaluating the information obtained via said first information collection service; a service for determining an authorized amount of financial aid the given student is eligible for at the given educational institution, as disclosed by AAPA, to provide a web-based student financial aid delivery and management system where the entire financial aid process is interactive and online for instantaneous Plus loan pre-approval, calculating college cost and post graduation budget planning.

Norris discloses receiving an electronic copy of loan document of borrower (analogous to an Institutional Student Information Report (ISIR) document for the given student); a service for comparing information obtained via said first information collection service (database - analogous service) and the given borrowers loan application/document (analogous to student's ISIR document) [See entire document particularly, abstract; Figure 1; col. 2 lines 17-34; col. 7 lines 55-65; claim 1 - comparing two documents for verification]. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Regan, Ireland, and AAPA and include verification process, as disclosed by Norris, to provide a borrower's data matching system to verify the borrower's identity against third party database for processing/approval of loan.

Re. Claim 12, Regan discloses wherein said web-based application further comprises a registration service for applying for and receiving a user identification element, and whereby said user identification element is utilized for obtaining future access to said web-based application, including various features and services thereof [see enrollment and online application].

Re. Claim 13, Regan discloses a second information collection service, for obtaining additionally requested information related to personal demographics, financial matters, and educational endeavors of a given student [see enrollment certification, inherent in enrollment process].

Re. Claim 13, Regan discloses a federal link service (www.fafsa.ed.gov) for electronically relaying federal aid eligibility information between the web based application and processing systems of selected government agencies, wherein one of said selected government agencies corresponds to the United States Department of Education [pages 4 paragraph # 8 to page 5 paragraph # 2].

Re. Claim 17, 19-25, and 55-59 Regan discloses federal aid link service provides links at the web-based system for directly connecting a user to a FAFSA on-line web-based location and to an Ins on-line web-based location [page 4 paragraph 8]. Ireland discloses selected information obtained via said student file establishment service comprises information obtained via said first information collection service and said second information collection service, federal aid eligibility information obtained via said federal link service, and enrollment information about a given student obtained from an educational institution [col. 7 lines 10-30, 51-65; see database Figure 1], a file processing service for reviewing information collected about a given student via said file establishment service and for determining eligibility for various types of financial aid that are potentially available for a student, a loan application service for electronically relaying master promissory note (MPN) documentation between a system user and a loan guarantor, wherein said loan guarantor is characterized as one who provides monetary assistance to a student for education-related expenses, a reporting system service available to a user of the web-based application, for obtaining updated

Art Unit: 3692

information about the financial aid system and progress involved with said file processing service thereof, a communications service for automatically generating and sending an electronic communication from a student or educational institution to a student financial aid processor, and wherein the user identification element received via said registration service is utilized as an electronic signature for affirming various statements presented in accordance with the multi-level financial aid system [see entire document particularly; col. 3 line 51 to col. 4 line 4; col. 6 line 55 to col. 7 line 65; col. 22 lines 7 to col. 23 line 28; claims 1-2]. Additionally, a service for obtaining a copy of an Institutional Student Information Report (ISIR) document for the given student, a service for obtaining enrollment verification information for the given student from one or more specified educational institutions, and wherein selected portions of the information obtained from said first information collection service, said service for obtaining a copy of an ISIR document and said service for obtaining enrollment verification information are reviewed by a financial aid processing center, a service for comparing information obtained via said first information collection service and the given student's ISIR document;

a service for determining what financial aid the given student is eligible for; and a service for providing an award notice to the given student based on the determination of financial aid eligibility, and a service for determining whether the given student's corresponding information complies with federal regulatory standards for financial aid eligibility are inherent in Regan, Ireland and AAPA. Further, an integrated feature that automatically updates the web-based application, particularly updating information

Art Unit: 3692

related to received documents and progress of financial aid processing is well-known specially software companies website such as Microsoft explores which automatically updates the website. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Regan, AAPA and Norris and include the disclosure of Ireland, as disclosed above, to provide a method and apparatus for students and parents with education financing information, online filing at reduce the costs for a school to transmit financial aid award packages to potential students and help student to apply timely for student aid and get the result/decision quickly using their computer.

Claims 60-66 are rejected with same rational as claim 11 and associated dependent claims (Regan in view of Ireland, AAPA and Norris).

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 3692

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HARISH T. DASS whose telephone number is (571)272-6793. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM to 4:50 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Abdi Kambiz can be reached on 571-272-6702. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Harish T Dass/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3692

1/18/2009